

July 27, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/11/04 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300190011-7

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4127

Roll call No.	Date	H.R. No.	Vote				Brief description
			R.B.C.	Yea	Nay	Not voting	
181	July 12	8856	Yea	216	139	78	To amend Atomic Energy Act to permit construction of overhead transmission lines (34 vote needed; measure failed).
182	July 12	242	Yea	336	22	76	To more equally apportion summer civil service jobs in Washington, D.C., among young people of all the States.
183	July 12		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri. (71 Members absent.)
184	July 13		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Devine, Republican, of Ohio. (38 Members absent.)
*185	July 13	S. 559	Nay	285	103	44	Acceptance of conference report on Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act.
186	July 14		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa. (30 Members absent.)
187	July 14		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri. (30 Members absent.)
188	July 14	8928	Nay	187	218	29	Coinage Act of 1965, amendment to maintain silver content in dimes and quarters.
189	July 14	8928	Yea	255	151	27	On passage of Coinage Act of 1965.
190	July 15		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Roudabush, Republican, of Indiana. (39 Members absent.)
191	July 15		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Berry, Republican, of South Dakota. (39 Members absent.)
192	July 19		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa. (97 Members absent.)
193	July 19	9075	Yea	410	0	23	Quorum call by Mr. Cederberg, Republican, of Michigan. (26 Members absent.)
194	July 21		Present				On passage of military pay bill.
195	July 22		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Pelly, Republican, of Washington. (25 Members absent.)
*196	July 22	8283	Nay	178	227	28	Motion to recommit Economic Opportunity Act amendments.
*197	July 22	8283	Yea	245	158	30	On passage of Economic Opportunity Act amendments.

\*Items so marked are considered to be of greater significance, and a brief explanation is included herein.

## Keep 14(b) Alive

SPEECH  
OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I have listened intently to the debate on adoption of the rule for consideration of H.R. 77, to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. The arguments on both sides have been impressive. However, I believe the Cleveland Press, one of my hometown newspapers, has very succinctly "hit the nail on the head" with an editorial entitled "Keep 14(b) Alive." Believing my colleagues will be interested in reading this editorial, I include it as part of my remarks:

[From the Cleveland Press, May 19, 1965]

## KEEP 14(b) ALIVE

The Press believes that labor unions, honestly run, perform valuable service for their members, the community and the country. But this newspaper also favors keeping alive the principle of freedom of choice in an increasingly regimented world.

For both these reasons, this newspaper urges Congress not to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which permits States to pass so-called right-to-work laws barring compulsory union membership.

When the question of right-to-work arose in Ohio in 1958, the Press vigorously led the fight which kept it from being the law of the State. Yet the Press believes that voters in every State should be allowed to decide this—as Ohioans decided—for themselves.

Section 14(b) has been denounced by labor leaders as a death blow to union organizing drives. It has been sanctified by antiunion employers as a magna carta for their employees. Since it was enacted 17 years ago, it has been the target of more hot air from both sides than almost any other piece of legislation within memory.

Using official Government statistics, it can be "proved beyond doubt" that workers in the 19 States with right-to-work laws are: (a) moving faster economically than those in States without them, or (b) falling behind the employees in the 31 other States. What is "proved" depends on the preconceived point of view.

The fact is that section 14(b) is neither as bad as its opponents claim nor as effective

as its supporters pretend. It does not prevent unions from organizing every worker in the United States if they are able to do so. Conversely, it neither grants the right to work to anyone nor gives Federal sanction to union busting anywhere.

What it does is simple. It says that a State, if it wishes, may pass a law forbidding union membership as a condition of employment—in other words, barring anyone from being forced to join a union in order to hold a job.

*Fe* *W. J. Bryan Dorn*  
Professors Back President Johnson's  
Vietnam Policy

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it was encouraging and refreshing to see the following editorial in the Washington Evening Star on Tuesday, July 20:

## VIETNAM AND THE PROFESSORS

Despite some impressions to the contrary, not all college and university professors are alienated from the real world or lost in a fog of doctrinaire absurdities. There are important and numerous exceptions. This has been made abundantly clear by a group of 67 of them who have issued an excellent statement strongly supporting what our country is doing in an effort to save southeast Asia from Communist engulfment.

The group—made up chiefly of political scientists, historians, and economists with a special understanding of Asian affairs—has left no room for doubt about its endorsement of that effort. Its words deserve to be quoted at some length: "We believe the U.S. policy . . . is consistent with the realities . . . and the peace and freedom of South Vietnam." Accordingly it is necessary to "dispel the notion that any small but active and vocal groups of teachers and students speak for the entire community" on this issue. "We reject the bizarre political doctrine that President Johnson or his principal advisers have special obligations to the academic community. Obviously, the administration has obligations to explain its policies to the American people. But to suggest that some group of university professors has a 'right' to a special accounting is as outrageous as to suggest that the corporation executives

of America, the plumbers, the small businessmen, or the barbers have special claims on the Government and its principal spokesmen."

Well said. So well said, in fact, and so sensibly, that it should be circulated throughout the academic world, at home and abroad, where too much poisonous nonsense is being written and spoken about the fight for freedom in Vietnam.

Korea: America's Gallant Little Neighbor  
in the Pacific Community

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1965

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 12th anniversary of the armistice which ended the conflict in Korea. Once unknown to most of us, Korea now stands as a symbol of American resolve not to let free peoples fall under the tyranny of Communist armies, not to allow the Far East to fall under the domination of a single power, and not to let a friend down no matter how small. But Korea is much, much more than a symbol. The Republic of Korea has become one of America's best friends, one of our good neighbors in the Pacific community. On this occasion, I feel that it is appropriate to take a fresh look at this little republic to examine its place in the world and in the Pacific community.

Certainly, the past 12 years have not been easy ones for the Republic of Korea and her people. Although the guns have officially ceased fire, the war has not really ended, as two still very hostile armies confront one another across the now famous DMZ each actively probing the heavily fortified lines of the other for weak spots. South of the DMZ, the Korean people have faced 12 years of hardship in reconstructing a war-devastated homeland. They have suffered political instability marked by corruption, riots, and coups d'etat. They have undergone 12 years of economic difficulties and natural disasters such as the

floods of a week ago which claimed so many lives. Too, Korea today is afflicted with the classic problems of a developing nation: A rapidly increasing population, a maldistribution of employment between the agricultural and industrial sectors of the economy, a lack of diversification in agricultural production which has resulted in the economy's heavy dependence on the annual rice crop, a lack of entrepreneurial initiative and corporate organization of industry due in large part to the extended family tradition which discourages cooperation outside the formal family organization, an absence of a sense of community endeavor both within the agricultural sector in such areas as cooperative marketing and credit arrangements and within the urban regions in such areas as the building of sewers. As if all of this were not enough, Korea also faces serious monetary problems characterized and compounded by inflation, a shortage of capital, and an unfavorable balance of trade with other countries.

Despite this plethora of seemingly insurmountable problems, rays of hope are continually breaking through Korea's cloudy economic sky. After the armistice went into effect a determined Korean people turned to the task of reconstructing their war-ravaged nation. With the assistance of the United Nations and the United States they cleared the rubble and built new cities, enacted land reforms, and transformed the countryside from barren, trench-scarred hills to a checkerboard of rice paddies and rural towns. When they finished with reconstruction, the Korean people, aroused by the determination to secure a better life for themselves and for their children, went right on working to build a base from which they could modernize their economy. They began building the power and transportation facilities necessary to a modern economy. They opened a factory for the manufacture of freight and passenger railroad cars to meet one of Korea's greatest transportation needs—the lack of adequate rolling stock. They increased production of electricity from 900 million kilowatt hours in 1954, to 2 billion in 1962. Most significantly, the Korean people undertook a great educational endeavor, they became a nation going to school. Today, some 3,000 adults attend evening folk schools for literacy training and there are over 2 million students enrolled in primary, secondary, and higher educational institutions. As a result of the intensified educational effort in Korea some 85 percent of the people have achieved literacy. This accomplishment in addition to the natural knack of the Koreans for careful, detailed work has given Korea one of her greatest assets—a highly trainable, effective labor force.

Moreover, the Korean Government, sensitive to the people's desire for a better life, is looking to the future and making a frontal assault on Korea's problems in a series of 5-year development plans. Like many developing nations, Korea has two major economic goals: A more rapid increase in gross national product and a higher standard of living for all her people. The Korean Govern-

ment formulated these development goals in its first 5-year plan—1961-66—a plan which does not set absolute volume production goals but which indicates priority industries and sectors for government credit and assistance. Three major areas of priority in the first plan are energy production—primarily electrical and coal—agricultural production with emphasis on the fertilizer industry, and the building of social overhead capital such as roads, multipurpose dams and urban public works. Another major objective of the present plan is to reverse the existing unfavorable balance-of-payments situation, by making an increase in exports one of the nation's primary goals.

Moreover, the government has taken several varied approaches to alleviate the shortage of capital in the country. These have included a limitation of the use of foreign exchange to those commodities which are fundamental to capital producing industries and a proposal for a domestic commercial Bank of Korea to be located in the United States. The bank was originally suggested by a group of American businessmen of Korean extraction and was envisioned as a cushion in Korea's international financing. Not only would the bank facilitate international exchange but half of the capital would be furnished by the Korean-American community and the other half by the Republic of Korea. The proposed bank would be strategically located in southern California, an area which already carries on a lively trade with Korea. This trade is certain to grow with the establishment of the bank and with the growth of Korea's developing economy.

As a result of her efforts and achievements of the past 12 years, Korea today is visibly moving forward. Her growth rates have been high and are getting higher year by year. In 1961—the first year of the plan—the growth rate was 4.8 percent. It slipped in 1962 to 3.5 percent due to a bad harvest the year before. In 1963 it soared to a vigorous 6.8 percent and last year went up even further to 6.9 percent. And although the agricultural sector is growing slowly, at 2.7 percent, the industrial production index has bounded upward at 12.8 percent per year for the last 3 years. Finally, exports last year rose 39 percent to \$119.1 million, a continuation of a 3-year trend.

Although classified by the economists as a developing nation, Korea's determination to move up the ladder and her recent successes in doing so mark her as a peninsula of opportunity for her neighbors in the Pacific community. Indeed, Korea has already become a vigorous participant in the Pacific community of forward-moving nations. Traditionally, a buffer state between Japan and China and known throughout Asian history as a "Hermit Kingdom," Korea today is very much aware of her dependence on foreign trade for her success in economic development and looks to the Pacific community for markets and supplies. The bulk of Korean export trade is carried on with Taiwan, Hong Kong, Thailand, the United States, and Japan. The

latter is Korea's most important trading partner outside the U.S.-AID program, supplying 47 percent of Korea's non-AID financed imports and receiving 25 percent of her exports.

The major suppliers for two of Korea's newest and most rapidly growing light industries, the rubber tire and plywood industries, are all from the Pacific community—the United States, Malaysia, the Philippines, and New Zealand. Most of the capital machinery as well as the key mechanical inputs for public works construction come from the Pacific Community, primarily from Japan and the United States. Pacific businessmen, recognizing the potential in the highly trainable and low-cost Korean labor force, are utilizing that potential through what is known as bonded trade. For example, Japanese businessmen import raw goods, primarily textiles and crude rubber, which are then processed in Korea. The processed goods are then exported by the supplier who distributes the finished commodities through his established markets. Korea now maintains a lively bonded trade with such Pacific neighbors as Vietnam, Hong Kong, and Japan.

But the present is only prolog for richer opportunities as Korea seeks to achieve the objectives of her development plans. One of these objectives is the attainment of self-sufficiency in food production by 1969. That means a growing market for the tools Korea will need to modernize her agriculture and improve her productivity—irrigation equipment, farm machinery, farm chemicals, and agricultural technology. Moreover, until that objective is attained, Korea will continue to have to import foods to feed her people from outside. That means a continuing market for foods produced by American farmers who sold in calendar year 1963 over \$100 million worth of foodstuffs to the Korean people.

Another objective is the development of industries for the production of machinery, chemicals, iron, steel, and related products. That means markets for sophisticated capital equipment and for industrial know-how. Enterprising and imaginative American businessmen have already recognized their own opportunities in Korea's industrial future. The Gulf Oil Co. and a consortium of Skelly Oil Inc. and Swift & Co. have each contracted with the Korean Government to build a fertilizer plant, each of which will produce some 180,000 metric tons of compound fertilizer and some 84,000 metric tons of urea fertilizer annually. Moreover, as Korea grows and develops, an expanding economy will mean expanding personal incomes which in turn will mean a growing market for consumer goods as Korea's 30 millions of people reach for a better, richer life for themselves.

So, as Korea forges ahead, her requirements will be America's opportunities. But let us not take those opportunities for granted. Let us not rest on the present advantage tendered our traders by the American AID program. For as the Korean market develops with that nation's advance, competitors will surely seek to capture it for themselves with